



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/394,590	09/13/1999	DANIEL PAUL BURTON	26530.3	4471
27683	7590	02/10/2004	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202			NGUYEN, THU HA T	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2155		19
DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/394,590	BURTON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thu Ha T. Nguyen	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2003 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-45 are presented for examination.
2. This office action is responsive to the amendment filed on November 20, 2003. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, and 40 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on November 20, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reason:

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicants argue that Meyer, Dillingham, Deen and Shrader taken together still fail to teach or suggest the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring and user rights administration operations and administering user right to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring software, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation. First, in response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring and user rights administration operations and administering user right to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol" has not been given patentable weight

because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Second, Examiner asserts that Deen does teach the deficiencies of Meyer and Dillingham that is "wherein the administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring software, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation" as shown in abstract, col. 1 lines 58-col. 2 lines 24, col. 3 lines 4-24, col. 7 lines 14-col. 8 lines 24, col. 11 lines 57-col. 12 lines 7, col. 12 lines 53-col. 13 lines 9.

As a result, cited prior arts do disclose a system and method for manipulating objects by using an Internet protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring and user rights administration operations, as broadly claimed by the Applicants. Applicants clearly have still failed to identify specific claim limitations that would define a clearly patentable distinction over prior arts.

Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 40 and 43. Claims 2-11, 13-22, 24-33, 35-39, 41-42, and 44-45 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the office action [see rejection below]. Accordingly, claims 1-45 are respectfully rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1-4, 12-14, 20-25, 31-34, 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer et al., (hereinafter Meyer) U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 in view of Dillingham U.S. Patent No. 6,327,608, and further in view of Deen et al., (hereinafter Deen) U.S. Patent No. 6,351,748.

6. In reference to claims 1 and 12, Meyer discloses a method for manipulating objects by using an Internet protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring and user rights administration operations, the method comprising:

receiving a request using the protocol for a manipulation of a first network object from a requesting user, wherein the first network object includes at least one from the groups consisting of: devices, resources and container objects (abstract, figures 1, 3A Item 305, col. 3 lines 26-col. 4 lines 21);

verifying a first set of authorization information (Figure 3A Item 310);

checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user (Figure 3A Item 340); verifying a username and a password for the requesting user (Figure 3A Item 342);

determining an object type for the first network object (Figure 3A Items 382-384); and sending a response to the requesting user (Figure 3B Item 390); administrating user rights to the first network object (figures 3A-B).

Meyer discloses the HTTP Response but does not disclose the translation from logical to physical location. However, Dillingham disclose steps of translating a logical object address to a physical file system path (Col. 8 lines 33-55); and checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user including determining whether the first network object is a network object (Figure 4 Item 220). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer to include the translation as disclosed by Dillingham because the translation system will eliminate the need for the remote administrator to remember the entire path and exact name of the file on the server (Col. 1 lines 54-67). Furthermore, Dillingham teaches that this translation system prevents the inability to browse the server's physical files and directories from a remote computer over the Internet.

Furthermore, Meyer discloses checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user. Meyer does not expressly include determining whether the first network object is a network object. However, this feature is deemed to be obvious from the Meyer system as col. 5 lines 20-32 teaches that the administration can browse and

select a number of network objects and its respective identification information. Therefore, the object must be verified to determine whether the requested/selected object is that first object before identification information is displayed.

Meyer and Dillingham do not explicitly teach the using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol and administering user right to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring software, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation. Deen teaches the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol and administering user right to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring software, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation (abstract, col. 1 lines 58-col. 2 lines 24, col. 3 lines 4-24, col. 7 lines 14-col. 8 lines 24, col. 11 lines 57-col. 12 lines 7, col. 12 lines 53-col. 13 lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer, Dillingham and Deen to have the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol because it would have an efficient communications system which allows users to collaboratively edit, manage and authorize web content or files on remote web servers.

7. In reference to claim 23, Meyer discloses a system for manipulating network objects by using an Internet protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring and user rights administration operations, the system comprising:

a web server (Figure 1 Item 116); a work station connected to the web server by an Internet connection (Figure 1 Items 102-108);

at least one network server connected to the web server (Col. 3 lines 40-45);

at least one storage system connected to the web server (Figure 1 Item 112);

means for receiving a request using the protocol for a manipulation of a first network object from the work station, wherein the first network object includes at least one from the group consisting of devices, resources and container objects (abstract, figures 1, 3A Item 305, col. 3 lines 25-col. 4 lines 21);

means for verifying a first set of authorization information (Figure 3A Item 310);

means for checking for validity and authorization for a requesting user (Figure 3A Item 340);

means for verifying a username and a password for the requesting user (Figure 3A Item 342);

means for determining an object type for the first network object (Figure 3A Item 382 and 384); and

means for sending a response to the requesting user (Figure 3B Item 390);

administering user rights to the first network object (figures 3A-B).

Meyer discloses the HTTP Response but does not disclose the means for translating a logical Uniform Resource Locator to the storage system. However, Dillingham disclose steps of translating logical Uniform Resource Locator to the storage system (Col. 8 lines 33-55); and checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user including determining whether the first network object is a network object (Figure 4 Item 220). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer to include the translation as disclosed by Dillingham because the translation system will eliminate the need for the remote administrator to remember the entire path and exact name of the file on the server (Col. 1 lines 54-67). Furthermore, Dillingham teaches that this translation system prevents the inability to browse the server's physical files and directories from a remote computer over the Internet.

Furthermore, Meyer discloses checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user. Meyer does not expressly include determining whether the first network object is a network object. However, this feature is deemed to be obvious from the Meyer system as col. 5 lines 20-32 teaches that the administration can browse and select a number of network objects and its respective identification information. Therefore, the object must be verified to determine whether the requested/selected object is that first object before identification information is displayed.

Meyer and Dillingham do not explicitly teach the using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, and administering user right to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the

administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring software, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation. Deen teaches the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol and administering user right to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring software, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation (abstract, col. 1 lines 58-col. 2 lines 24, col. 3 lines 4-24, col. 7 lines 14-col. 8 lines 24, col. 11 lines 57-col. 12 lines 7, col. 12 lines 53-col. 13 lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Meyer, Dillingham and Deen to have the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol because it would have an efficient communications system which allows users to collaboratively edit, manage and authorize web content or files on remote web servers.

8. In reference to claim 34, Meyer discloses a method for manipulating network objects by using Internet protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring and user right administration operations, the method comprising:

receiving a request using the protocol for a manipulation of a first network object from a requesting user (abstract, figures 1, 3A Item 305, col. 3 lines 25-col. 4 lines 21); verifying a first set of authorization information (Figure 3A Item 310);

checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user, wherein the first network object includes at least one from the group consisting of: devices, resources and container objects (Figure 3A Item 340);

verifying a username and a password for the requesting user (Figure 3A Item 342); returning a first error message if requesting user is unauthorized to access the first network object (Figure 3A Item 346);

determining an object type for the first network object (Figure 3A Item 382 and 384); sending a response to the requesting user (Figure 3B Item 390); navigating a context menu for a plurality of screens that allow modification of the set of attributes of the first network object (Figure 5 and 6); and

modifying a set of attributes of the first network object by modifying a set of fields on a screen of a subset of the set of attributes (Figure 6 and 7);

administrating user rights to the first network object (figures 3A-B).

Meyer discloses the HTTP Response but does not disclose the means for translating a logical object address to a physical file system path. However, Dillingham disclose steps of translating logical object address to a physical file system path (Col. 8 lines 33-55); and checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user including determining whether the first network object is a network object (Figure 4 Item 220). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer to include the translation as disclosed by Dillingham because the translation system will eliminate the need for the remote administrator to remember the entire path and exact name of the

file on the server (Col. 1 lines 54-67). Furthermore, Dillingham teaches that this translation system prevents the inability to browse the server's physical files and directories from a remote computer over the Internet.

Furthermore, Meyer discloses checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user. Meyer does not expressly include determining whether the first network object is a network object. However, this feature is deemed to be inherent from the Meyer system as col. 5 lines 20-32 teaches that the administration can browse and select a number of network objects and its respective identification information. Therefore, the object must be verified to determine whether the requested/selected object is that first object before identification information is displayed.

Meyer and Dillingham do not explicitly teach the using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol and administering user right to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring software, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation. Deen teaches the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol and administering user right to the first network object using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring software, related to the authoring operations and administration of the user rights, installed on a user workstation (abstract, col. 1 lines 58-col. 2 lines 24, col. 3 lines 4-24, col. 7 lines 14-col. 8 lines 24, col. 11 lines 57-col. 12 lines 7, col. 12 lines 53-col. 13 lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Meyer, Dillingham and Deen to have the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol because it would have an efficient communications system which allows users to collaboratively edit, manage and authorize web content or files on remote web servers.

9. In reference to claim 40, Meyer discloses a computer network for a plurality of users to access a workplace by using an Internet protocol, wherein the protocol allows user to perform remote web content authoring and user right administration operations, the system comprising:

 a plurality of network computer servers within the computer network (Col. 3 lines 40-45);

 a plurality of network computer workstations within the computer network and connected to at least one of the plurality of network computer servers (Figure 1 Items 102 -108);

 a file system, network directory, and printing subsystem on the computer network and accessible by the plurality of users by the protocol (Figure 2 Item 215);

 a security system that provides an authentication process in order to allow access to the plurality of users to the file system, network directory, and printing subsystem (Figure 3A); and

 a graphical user interface using the protocol for viewing the file system, network directory and printing subsystem as the workplace, and providing the plurality of users

the ability to manipulate the file system, network directory and printing subsystem and the ability to run a plurality of network applications within the file system and network directory portions of the subsystem (Abstract and Figure 5);

administering user rights to the first network object (figures 3A-B).

Meyer and Dillingham do not explicitly teach the using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol and administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring authoring operations software, related to the administration of the user rights, on a user workstation. Deen teaches the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol and administration of the user rights is allowed without requiring authoring operations software, related to the administration of the user rights, on a user workstation (abstract, col. 1 lines 58-col. 2 lines 24, col. 3 lines 4-24, col. 7 lines 14-col. 8 lines 24, col. 11 lines 57-col. 12 lines 7, col. 12 lines 53-col. 13 lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Meyer, Dillingham and Deen to have the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol because it would have an efficient communications system which allows users to collaboratively edit, manage and authorize web content or files on remote web servers.

10. In reference to claims 43, Meyer discloses a method for manipulating objects by using an Internet protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring and user rights administration operations, the method comprising:

receiving a first request using the protocol for a manipulation of a first network object from a requesting user, wherein the first network object includes at least one from the groups consisting of: devices, resources and container objects (abstract, figures 1, 3A Item 305, col. 3 lines 26-col. 4 lines 21);

verifying a first set of authorization information (Figure 3A Item 310);
checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user (Figure 3A Item 340); verifying a username and a password for the requesting user (Figure 3A Item 342);

determining an object type for the first network object (Figure 3A Items 382-384);
and sending a response to the requesting user (Figure 3B Item 390);
giving the requesting user first access control rights to the first network object (figures 3A-B).

Meyer discloses the HTTP Response but does not disclose the translation from logical to physical location. However, Dillingham disclose steps of translating a logical object address to a physical file system path (Col. 8 lines 33-55); and checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user including determining whether the first network object is a network object (Figure 4 Item 220). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer to include the translation as disclosed by Dillingham because the translation system will eliminate the need for the remote administrator to remember the entire path and exact name of the file on the server (Col. 1 lines 54-67). Furthermore, Dillingham teaches that this translation system prevents

the inability to browse the server's physical files and directories from a remote computer over the Internet.

Furthermore, Meyer discloses checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user. Meyer does not expressly include determining whether the first network object is a network object and assigning new access control rights to the first network object to a second user in response to an action of the requesting user. However, this feature is deemed to be obvious from the Meyer system as col. 5 lines 20-32 teaches that the administration can browse and select a number of network objects and its respective identification information. Therefore, the object must be verified to determine whether the requested/selected object is that first object before identification information is displayed. And from the Meyer system as shown in figures 3A-B, col. 4 lines 35-48 teaches that more than one user can have the rights to access to web content if user authentication is valid. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that when the system can do the step of authentication and assign the user rights to access Internet for one user (first user), then that system can have an ability to authenticate and assign the user rights to access Internet for multiple users (first, second, third user...) to provide efficient and flexible communication system.

Meyer and Dillingham do not explicitly teach the using the Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol and using Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, assigning new access control rights to the first network object to a second user in response to an action of the requesting user. Deen teaches the step of

using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol and using Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, assigning new access control rights to the first network object to a second user in response to an action of the requesting user (abstract, col. 1 lines 58-col. 2 lines 24, col. 3 lines 4-24, col. 7 lines 14-col. 8 lines 24, col. 11 lines 57-col. 12 lines 7, col. 12 lines 53-col. 13 lines 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer, Dillingham and Deen to have the step of using the Internet authoring, collaborating and versioning protocol because it would have an efficient communications system which allows users to collaboratively edit, manage and authorize web content or files on remote web servers.

11. In reference to claim 2, 22, and 33, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose method of claim 1, 12, and 23. Further Meyer discloses wherein the manipulation of the first network object includes changing a set of attributes of the first network object (Col. 6 lines 1-22).

12. In reference to claim 3, 13, and 24, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose the method of claim 1, 12 and 23. Meyer does not disclose verifying that the first object is found. However, Dillingham discloses a step of verifying that the first network object is found (Col. 5 lines 51-55 and Figure 3 Item 112-114 and Figure 4 Item 220-222). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer to include the verification because proper error trapping offers an extra layer of verification thereby resulting in a more efficient and robust system.

13. In reference to claim 4, 14, and 25, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose the method of claim 3, 13, 24. Meyer does not disclose the step of returning a second error message if the first network object is not found. However, Dillingham discloses the step of returning a second error message if the first network object is not found. (Col. 7 lines 59-65 and Figure 4 Item 220-222). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer to include the second error message because proper error trapping offers an extra layer of verification. More importantly, the error message provides informational feedback for the user.

14. In reference to claim 10, 20, and 31, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose the method of claim 1, 12, and 23. Meyer further includes modifying a set of attributes of the first network object by modifying a set of fields on a screen of a subset of the set of attributes (Figure Col. 6 lines 20-59 and Figure 6).

15. In reference to claim 11, 21 and 33, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose the method of claim 10, 20, and 31. Meyer further includes navigating a

context menu for a plurality of screens that allow modification of the set of attributes of the first network object (Figure 5).

16. In reference to claim 41, Meyer discloses the computer network of claim 40 wherein the computer network is a global Internet network and the file and directory subsystem is within an intranet network (Figure 1).

17. In reference to claim 42, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose the computer network of claim 40. Meyer further teaches where the graphical user interface is a web browser (Abstract).

18. Claims 5-6, 15-16, 26-27, 35-36 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer, Dillingham and Deen as applied to claim 1, 12, 23, and 34 above, and further in view of Shrader et al., (hereinafter Shrader) U.S. Patent No. 6,195,097.

19. In reference to claim 5, 15, 26, and 35, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose the method of claim 1, 12, 23, and 34. Meyer discloses a variety of activities performed through the web browser including file system browsing, process viewing and modifications of network objects (Col. 6 lines 1-22). Meyer and Dillingham both do not disclose assigning new rights to the first network object. However, Shrader discloses a web-based distributed computing environment to administer and manage computer

resources. Shrader also disclose that network administrators can modify the security attributes, such as system privileges, of an object (Col. 4 lines 5-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer and Dillingham to include the feature of assigning new rights to the first network object because assigning user's rights is a network administrative task similar to file system browsing and process viewing. The need for network administrator to configuring network objects easily, securely and quickly from a remote secure web browser is just as important as for an administrator to assign user's rights.

20. In reference to claim 6, 16, 27 and 36, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose the method of claim 5, 15, 26, and 35. Meyer and Dillingham do not disclose wherein the new rights for the first network object are for a second network object. However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that two objects can have the same set of rights. Two objects can be configured with the same security privileges using the Shrader system. Therefore, claim 6, 16, 27, and 36 are rejected until the same rationale as claims 5, 15, 26 and 35.

21. Claims 7-9, 17-19, 28-30, 37-39, and 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer and Dillingham, Deen and Shrader as applied to claims 5, 7, 15, 17, 26, 27, 35, and 37 above and further in view of Smith II et al., (hereinafter Smith II) U.S. Patent No. 5,884,298.

22. In reference to claim 7, 17, 28, and 37, Meyer, Dillingham and Shrader together discloses the method of claim 5, 15, 26, and 35. However, Meyer, Dillingham and Shrader together does not disclose wherein the new rights are assigned by dragging and dropping a second network object on the first network object by the use of an interactive computer screen. Official notice is taken that the drag and drop feature to assign the properties of one object to another is well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have dragging and dropping a second network object on the first network object by the use of an interactive computer screen because it would have an efficient communication system that allows the network administrator to configuring network objects easily, securely and quickly from a remote secure web browser is just as important as for an administrator to assign user's rights.

23. In reference to claim 8, 18, 29, and 38, Meyer, Dillingham, and Shrader together discloses the method of claim 7, 17, 27, and 37. However, Meyer, Dillingham, and Shrader do not disclose wherein the new rights are all rights for all users and assigned by dragging a public icon and dropping the public icon on the first network object. Smith II discloses the method of manipulating objects by dragging and dropping icons, icons being associated with the objects (Abstract). Smith II also discloses a hierarchical index to a user with a private CD Exchanger and a Network Access CD Exchanger. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Meyer, Dillingham, and Shrader together to drag and drop the public icon on the first network object to assign users rights because the drag and drop feature is known in the art to associate properties with one another (col. 20 lines 14-15).

24. In reference to claim 9, 19, 30, and 39, Meyer and Dillingham together disclose the method of claim 7, 17, 27, and 37. However, Meyer, Dillingham, and Shrader does not disclose wherein the new rights are subtracting all rights for all users except an assigned user to the first network object and wherein the new rights are assigned by dragging a private icon and dropping the private icon on the first network object. Smith II discloses the method of manipulating objects by dragging and dropping icons, icons being associated with the objects (Abstract). Smith II also discloses a hierarchical index to a user with a private CD Exchanger and a Network Access CD Exchanger. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Meyer, Dillingham, and Shrader together to drag and drop the private icon on the first network object to assign users rights because the drag and drop feature is known in the art to associate properties with one another (col. 20 lines 14-15).

25. Claims 12-21, 23-32, and 44-45 have similar limitations as claims 1-11; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ThuHa Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-7447. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30am-5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ThuHa Nguyen

February 3, 2004



Patrice Winder
PATRICE WINDER
PRIMARY EXAMINER